

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
MARTINSBURG**

CHARLES CARD,

Petitioner,

v.

**CIVIL ACTION NO.: 3:20-CV-170
(GROH)**

BRYAN ANTONELLI, Warden,

Respondent.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Now before the Court is a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Robert W. Trumble. Pursuant to this Court’s Local Rules, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Trumble for submission of a proposed R&R. Magistrate Judge Trumble issued his R&R [ECF No. 12] on September 23, 2020. Therein, Magistrate Judge Trumble recommends that the Petitioner’s § 2241 petition [ECF No. 1] be denied and dismissed without prejudice, and that the Petitioner’s motions [ECF Nos. 7 & 8] be terminated as moot.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court must conduct a *de novo* review of the magistrate judge’s findings where objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge to which no objection is made. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and of a petitioner’s right to appeal this Court’s Order. 28.U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir.


1984).

Objections to Magistrate Judge Trumble's R&R were due within fourteen plus three days of service. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The R&R was mailed to the Petitioner by certified mail on September 23, 2020. ECF No. 12. The Petitioner accepted service on September 28, 2020. ECF No. 13. To date, no objections have been filed. Accordingly, this Court reviews the R&R for clear error.

Upon careful review and thoughtful consideration, it is the opinion of this Court that Magistrate Judge Trumble's R&R [ECF No. 12] should be, and is hereby, **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated therein. Therefore, the Petitioner's § 2241 Petition [ECF No. 1] is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. Additionally, the Petitioner's motions [ECF Nos. 7 & 8] are **DENIED** as **MOOT**.

The Court ORDERS that this matter be **STRICKEN** from the Court's active docket. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to mail a copy of this Order to the *pro se* Petitioner by certified mail, return receipt requested, at his last known address as reflected on the docket sheet.

DATED: December 21, 2020


GINA M. GROH
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE